REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 16, 17 and 20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 16, 17 and 20, in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,272,628 to Koss ("Koss"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Koss, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. In contrast to Claim 1, Koss teaches inputting values corresponding to a list of input tables and a specified output table template into a GenerateTable function. *See* Koss, col. 3, ll. 65 – col. 4, ll. 50. Koss does not disclose or suggest a method that includes receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets via a graphical control panel, as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, Koss does not disclose or suggest receiving, via the graphical control panel, a selection of portions of data from files corresponding to each of said plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from Claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, Koss fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 1.

In addition, the dependent claims include further features not found in the cited references. For example, none of the cited references, including Koss, disclose or suggest a method that includes selecting portions of data from files corresponding to each of a plurality of spreadsheets, by searching for desired text within the plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 7. In contrast to Claim 7, Koss discloses performing "a binary search ... to find the correct location in the *destination* table...." *See* Koss, col. 2, ll. 2-4 (emphasis added). For this additional reason, Claim 7 is allowable.

Further, none of the cited references, including Koss, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 10. In contrast to Claim 10, Koss teaches inputting values corresponding to a list of input tables and a specified output table template into a GenerateTable function. *See* Koss, col. 3, ll. 65 – col. 4, ll. 50. Koss does not disclose or suggest a computer program that

includes a spreadsheet selection procedure for receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets via a graphical control panel, as recited in Claim 10. Moreover, Koss does not disclose a data selection procedure for receiving, via the graphical control panel, a selection of portions of data from files corresponding to each of said plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 10. Thus, Claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 11 has been cancelled.

Additionally, none of the cited references, including Koss, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 12. In contrast to Claim 12, Koss teaches inputting values corresponding to a list of input tables and a specified output table template into a GenerateTable function. *See* Koss, col. 3, ll. 65 – col. 4, ll. 50. Koss does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying a graphical control panel that includes a spreadsheet selection area for receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets and a custom search module for receiving a selection of at least a portion of the selected plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 12. Thus, Claim 12 is allowable.

Claims 13-14, 16, 17 and 20 depend from Claim 12, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, Koss fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 13-14, 16, 17 and 20, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 12.

Claim 9 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 9, in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss, in view of US Application Pub. No. 2002/0083016 by Dittrich, et al. ("Dittrich"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

No motivation exists to make the combination asserted by the Office. Koss discloses a method and system that "allows the consolidation or aggregation of data in disparate tables into a single aggregate table which summarizes that data." *See* Koss, col. 2, ll. 31-34. Dittrich, on the other hand, is directed to a system for "enabling transactions over a network using multiple channels...." *See* Dittrich, paragraph [0003]. Dittrich should not be combined with Koss,

because the aggregated spreadsheets of Koss cannot be used to track an ongoing transaction state, as Dittrich requires. *See* Dittrich, paragraph [0016]. There is no motivation to make the combination asserted in the Office Action other than that provided by the Applicants' disclosure. The asserted combination is an impermissible hindsight reconstruction based on the Applicants' disclosure.

Additionally, neither Koss, nor Dittrich, discloses or suggests a method that includes receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets via a graphical control panel, as recited in Claim 1. Further, neither Koss, nor Dittrich, discloses or suggests receiving, via the graphical control panel, a selection of portions of data from files corresponding to each of said plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 1. Claim 9 depends from Claim 1. Thus, the asserted combination of Koss and Dittrich fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 9, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 1.

Moreover, Claim 9 includes further features not found in the cited references. For example, in contrast to Claim 9, Dittrich discloses a user database that stores "preferences of a particular user as to particular types of listings the user has interest in, payment arrangements, preferred contact methods, custom search criteria for listings, and any other information regarding a particular user...." *See* Dittrich, paragraph [0021]. None of the cited references, including Koss and Dittrich, disclose or suggest a method that includes storing a custom spreadsheet search associated with a plurality of spreadsheets and selected portions of data from files corresponding to each of the plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 9. Thus, for this additional reason, Claim 9 is allowable.

U.S. App. No.: 10/604,608

Claim 15 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 15, in paragraph 7 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss, in view of US Application Pub. No. 2003/0149934 by Worden, et al. ("Worden"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained previously, Koss does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying a graphical control panel that includes a spreadsheet selection area for receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets and a custom search module for receiving a selection of at least a portion of the selected plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 12. Worden does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying such a graphical control panel, but discloses a method for using extensive mark-up language (XML) "to describe how a document in a given XML language conveys information...." *See* Worden, paragraph [0027]. Thus, the asserted combination of Koss and Worden fails to disclose the specific combination of Claim 12. Claim 15 depends from Claim 12, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, Claim 15 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 12.

Claim 18 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 18, in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss, in view of US Patent No. 5,396,587 by Reed, et al. ("Reed"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained previously, Koss does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying a graphical control panel that includes a spreadsheet selection area for receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets and a custom search module for receiving a selection of at least a portion of the selected plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 12. Reed does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying such a graphical control panel, but rather discloses a display management system that includes means for generating and periodically updating a screen image. *See* Reed, col. 2, ll. 13-24. Thus, the asserted combination of Koss and Reed fails to disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 12. Claim 18 depends from Claim 12,

U.S. App. No.: 10/604,608

which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, Claim 18 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 12.

Claim 19 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 19, in paragraph 9 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss, in view of US Application Publication No. 2003/0061193 by Anson ("Anson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained previously, Koss does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying a graphical control panel that includes a spreadsheet selection area for receiving a selection of a plurality of spreadsheets and a custom search module for receiving a selection of at least a portion of the selected plurality of spreadsheets, as recited in Claim 12. Anson does not disclose or suggest a controller displaying such a graphical control panel, but rather discloses a method that uses data filters to generate focused data of interest to a user. *See* Anson, abstract. Thus, the asserted combination of Koss and Anson fails to disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 12. Claim 19 depends from Claim 12, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, Claim 19 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_12 - 28 - 2005_
Date

Chad M. Herring
Chad M. Herring; Reg. No. 41,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)

U.S. App. No.: 10/604,608